

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-52 were pending in this application when the present Office Action was mailed on July 21, 2008. In this response, no claims have been amended or cancelled. Claim 53 has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-53 are currently pending.

In the Non-final Office Action mailed on July 21, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. In particular:

A. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 23-29, 32-33, 38, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,416,705 to Barnett ("Barnett");

B. Claims 12 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in view of Barnett;

C. Claims 7, 16-18, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Barnett in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,499,025 to Middleton et al. ("Middleton");

D. Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Barnett in combination with U.S. Patent No. 4,224,669 to Brame ("Brame");

E. Claims 19, 20, 22, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Barnett in combination with U.S. Patent No. 5,475,594 to Oder et al. ("Oder"); and

F. Claims 34-37, 39-48, and 50-52 were rejected on the same basis as their corresponding method claims. For the reasons set forth in detail below, applicants submit that the present application, including each of pending claims, is in condition for allowance.

As a preliminary matter, the undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone interview on November 10, 2008, during which the current rejection and the prior art were discussed. The foregoing and following remarks summarize and expand upon the points discussed during the November 10 telephone interview. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that this paper constitute applicants' interview summary. If the Examiner notices any deficiencies in this regard, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney.

The claims of the current application are directed to, *inter alia*, a method and system for displaying assistance messages to an aircraft operator. For example, the method of claim 1 includes receiving an input from an aircraft operator. A characteristic of the input (e.g. length, format) is then compared to a target value of the characteristic. If the characteristic differs from the target value by a more than a threshold amount, an assistance message is displayed. The assistance message includes "at least one of a complying input and an instruction for creating a complying input."

Barnett fails to support a *prima facie* basis for rejecting claim 1 under Section 102 for at least the reason that Barnett fails to disclose or suggest "displaying an assistance message to the aircraft operator" if a characteristic of the input differs from a target value by at least a threshold amount, as is included in claim 1. Barnett discloses a system for processing alphanumeric commands input to the scratch pad area of an aircraft control system. See Barnett, Abstract. After the user inputs the alphanumeric command, the system compares the input to a database of possible command codes. See Barnett, col. 5, ln. 19-22. If the input matches a command code stored in CPU ROM, the system accepts the input and transmits the input to an active transponder. See Barnett, col. 5, ln. 22-26. If the input does not match a command code stored in CPU ROM, the system displays an error message and then blanks the screen for reentry of a new alphanumeric sequence. See Barnett, col. 5, ln. 26-33. Nothing in Barnett discloses or suggests "displaying an assistance message to the aircraft

operator," as recited in claim 1. In particular, although Barnett discloses that the system displays an error message, Barnett fails to disclose that the error message provides assistance such as "a complying input [or] an instruction for creating a complying input." The other cited references, including Brame, Middleton, and Oder, similarly fail to show at least this feature of claim 1. Thus, for at least this reason, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Independent claims 24, 33, 38, and 49 include features generally analogous to those discussed above with reference to claim 1. Therefore, the Section 102 rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2-23, 25-32, 34-37, 39-48, and 50-52 depend from these independent claims. Therefore, these claims should be allowed for at least the foregoing reasons and for the additional features present in the claims. For example, claim 15 includes "providing a first assistance message if the input fails to comply . . . on a first basis" and "providing a second assistance message . . . if the input fails to comply . . . on a second basis. . . ." Applicants respectfully submit that the references fail to disclose or suggest providing separate assistance messages depending on the basis by which the input fails to comply with the target characteristic, as included in claim 15.

New claim 53 has been added to depend from claim 24. Claim 53 includes features similar to claim 15 and should therefore be allowed for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. All fees were paid via EFT Account SEA1PIRM. If additional fees are due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 030048122US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: Nov. 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John M. Weckin

Registration No.: 42,216

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-3257

(206) 359-4257 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant